श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : इन्हें अपने शब्द वापस लेने चाहिये । ...(व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I am not permitting.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: A specific allegation was made by him. These remarks should not go on record. This is against the Home Minister. This should not be allowed to go on record...(*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Please take your seats. I request everyone to sit down, including you. Please sit down. Please take your seats. This is not proper. I am not going to permit any Member who speaks without my permission. No, I will not allow. This is not proper.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: But there is nothing unparliamentary in what he said. They only want to hold the House to ransom...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: He is accusing the Home Minister. Are you supporting him?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, I have said that I will look into the record. I am very sorry that Members are wasting the Question Hour which is their right to ask questions. I have already said that I will look into the record and see and if there is anything derogatory against any Member, and in this case against the Home Minister, that will not go on record. That ends the matter.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Will all this come on the T.V.?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, that will come on the T.V.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: When Chavanji was the Chief Minister, he and myself had 2-3 meetings. We had come nearer to an amicable solution. Now, as the hon. Home Minister, he has in his knowledge the problem and I want to know whether he will call both the Chief Ministers and make a fresh effort to sort it out amicably.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: If both the State Governments were to agree, certainly I will be happy...(*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, Let him answer.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN...to call both the Chief Ministers.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: We did not hear what the Home Minister said.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him answer.

बोलिए होम मिनिस्टर साहब ।.... (व्यवधान)..आप बैठ जाइये । प्लीज सुनने दीजिये ।

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I have already replied that if both the State Governments were to agree, certainly we will be too happy to call both of them.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: We want half-an-hour discussion on this question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You write to me and I will see. Next question No. 402.

Irrigation Project of Maharashtra

*402. SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV:†

SHRI SUSHILKUMAR SAMBHAJIRAO SHINDE:

Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the medium/minor irrigation Project of Jalod, Dhule,

*The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav.

Maharashtra which was started in 1981 was stopped by his Ministry, if so, the reasons therefor; and

(b) whether it is a fact that the Government of Maharashtra and the Collector of Dhule offered equivalant land for forest in other parts but his Ministry has not given clearance for starting the work on the project, if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) and (b) No proposal for diversion of forest land for medium/minor irrigation project in Dhule district of Maharashtra is pending with the Central Government as on 31st July, 1992 under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Madam, the hon. Minister has given a reply which does not carry any meaning. This concerns a small minor irrigation project. The problem is in regard to the acquisition of forest land. As a result of this, the project has been withheld. Madam, this project is in Jalod, in the tribal district of Dhule of Maharashtra State. It can irrigate just 600 hectares and would benefit 15,000 people. If the project had been completed, it would have generated an employment potential of 25 lakh mandays. The work on this project has been held up for eight years, which has resulted in a loss of 20 million mandays of employment.

The Maharashtra Government sanctioned this project on 31st March, 1981. As I said, this is in a tribal area. The project was started in 1983, under the Employment Guarantee Scheme. The work had been stopped by the Forest Department. Only 36.10 hectares of land would be submerged because of this project. The Maharashtra Government was prepared to hand over alternative land to the Forest Department. Even though they have handed over the land, in spite of that, they have raised an objection that some of the land is not suitable for forest plantation. If such a difficulty is there—I am coming to the question, Madam—will the hon. Minister assure this House that this project would be cleared within a period of one month? As I said, this is a very small project and, therefore he should clear this project within one month

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But a very long supplementary.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: While I completely share the hon. Member's concern in regard to this project, I would like to draw his attention to certain facts. Some of the things mentioned by him are not correct.

According to the facts available with me the administrative approval for this project was given in 1981. The work on this project was started on 8th November, 1982. The work was discontinued on 1st January, 1985. No work has been done in the forest area. It involves diversion of, submergence of, 33.10 hectares of forest land. The proposal for diversion is not lying with the Central Government. It is lying with the forest authorities in the district. I would like to tell the hon. Member that if he chases it up with the District Forest Officer, if he chases it up with the State Government, as soon as the proposal is received here, I shall certainly ensure that it is expeditiously dealt with.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Second supplementary.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: My second supplementary is, as per the Forest (Conservation) Act, if only 0.4 per cent of forest land is involved, construction of a project can be allowed. In this case,

where 33.10 hectares of land is the area which would be submerged, it is not even 0.4 per cent of forest land. In spite of that, the Forest Department has taken objection. It is less than even 0.4 per cent. It does not involve much of a forest area. Even then, the work has been held up. I do not know what are the reasons. The Maharashtra Government has been constantly pursuing this matter. The Forest Department has also written to the Government of India. It is not even necessary to write to the Government of India. Therefore, may I know from the hon. Minister—when it is not even 0.4 per cent of forest land—whether he would clear this project expeditiously?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Madam, it is not a question of the density of the forest land. The hon. Member is talking about the density, 0.4 per cent density of forest land. Under the Forest (Conservation) Act, it is not the density of the forest land which is taken into consideration. The point is whether the land concerned is a forest land. As I said earlier, I share the hon. Member's concern particularly, his concern in regard to such a backward area. If no other revenue land or compensatory land is available in this district, we shall certainly consider other compensatory land which maybe available in another district, specially, in his case. I would ask the hon. Member to pursue it..

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: They have made the offer already. They have given some land from another district. That thing is there.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: As of 31st July, as per the information received from the State Government, they have themselves said that this project is lying with them in fact, lying with the district officer for identification. No such land has yet been identified of the total land. If it is not available in this district, we shall consider it being compensatory land in another district in his case.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Prakash Ambedkar. (*Interruptions*). He won't ask. He gave his right of not asking.

SHRI SUSHILKUMAR SAMBHAJIRAO SHINDE: I will obey your orders.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: The lone Member of the House...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: ... Who obeys the order.

AN HON. MEMBER: The only one Member, with a qualification.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR: Madam, in this case 33.10 hectares of land have already been given to the Forest Department and a proposal has been sent to the Government, but in that case the reply that has been given by the Department to the State Government is that 29.2 hectares of land is not useful for forest purposes. I would like to know, what are the constituents that have been laid down to say that this land is good for forest and this land is not good for forest? May I know if any conditions have been laid down for that?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: With regard to the specific thing that some land has not been found suitable, only 9.5 hectares of land was found suitable for compensatory forestation. There is a criterion. Of course, there has to be a criterion with regard to some land given for compensatory forestation which is not forestable. This land is identified by the State Forest Department and the criterion is that it must be capable of being managed as a forest area. We cannot pick up a small chunk of 10 or 15 hectares which is away from forest land, which is not contiguous

to forest land. So, from forest management point of view the land should be forestable. In specific cases where this is not available in a district, we are permitting...

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR: What is meant by a forst land?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: As I said, one of the criteria is that it must be contiguous, there must be other forest area in that. We canont have a small parcel of land available somewhere, very far away, which is totally outside the scope, logistically, of forest areas. So, there is this criterion. Obviously, this land is identified by the State Government since they are required to do the afforestation, they are required to manage it. So, they are the ones who put up this proposal.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO GIRIDHAR PATIL: Madam, firstly, the availability of forest land is being questioned. My question is, supposing the land which is now required for that particular dam is not having forest even to the extent of 0.4 and it is absolutely rocky land, would it be really desirable for the Government to demand in exchange of that land a forestable land? That is what is happening in this particular case. Already the Collector has given 33 hectares of land. After six months the Department says that only 9 hectares are usable. The other condition is that it must be adjustable to forest. It must have one feet of soil. All these conditions are causing delay. These delays are causing enormous harm to the State. From Maharashtra alone 254 projects are pending and this is causing a lot of harm. I would like to know whether they would try to simplify the Act so that the projects are cleared speedly.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Madam, it has been my endeavour to simplify and expedite this procedure of forest clearance and I had announced that some new rules were being framed. This is in process and the notification on this is going to be issued very shortly. For up to 20 hectares of land a State Committee is going to be formed. That will be looked at by a State Committee consisting of the revenue officials and the project authorities. Where this specific case is concerned and with regard to this specific question as to where there is no forest, as I have said before, Madam, the question is not whether there is a forest or not. No forest there. It is the National Forest Policy that we must have 33 per cent of land under forest cover. Now, there has to be that land for us to be able to carry out afforestation. That if a forest land, which does not have any forest on it, is diverted away because it doesn't presently have a forest, then in future we cannot possibly have a forest because there will be no forest land—this understanding that diversion of forest land means that there must be a forest—is erroneous. There is a large part of forest land in the country which does not have any forest on it, and it is our endeavour to afforest it. So, that is what the policy is.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You mean to say that there were forests before but now there are no forests?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: There may have been forests, there must have been forests.

श्री मूलचंद मीणा : मैडम, राजस्थान धौलपुर में कोल बेस्ट ताप बिजली घर की एक योजना है। ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : यह सवाल उससे संबंधित नहीं है।

श्री मूलचंद मीणा : यह उसी से संबंधित है।

उपसभापति : नहीं, यह स्पेसिफिक क्वश्चन है । मुझे नहीं लगता कि यह उससे संबंधित है ।

श्री मूलचंद मीणा : सवाई माधोपुर में इन्दिरा लिफ्ट योजना है और राजस्थान के अन्दर ऐसी खनिज संपदा है, जो वन विभाग के एरिया के अंदर आती है, जिससे अरबों रुपये का राजस्व सरकार को मिल सकता है । . . . **(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me hear him. Then I can decide.

श्री मूलचंद मीणा : लेकिन उसके अंदर एक भी पेड़ या झाड़ियां नहीं है । परन्तु राजस्थान सरकार और जिलाधीशों ने यह प्रस्ताव बना कर भेजे हैं कि इस जमीन को फारेस्ट लैंड के एरिया में जोड़ दिया जाए और दूसरी जमीन हम इसके लिए उपलब्ध करा सकते हैं ।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूं कि आप ऐसी परियोजनाओं के लिए जो राजिस्थान सरकार और जिलाधीशों से प्रस्ताव आया है, उनके संबंध में एक क्रमबद्ध योजना बनाकर, क्या आप ऐसी परियोजना बनाकर, कोऑर्डिनेट देंगे, और यदि देंगे, तो कब तक देंगे ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. He has already answered that they have a policy under which, if it comes, he will see.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: It belongs to Dholpur in Rajasthan. It has nothing to do with the districts in Maharashtra.

Construction of bridge over Brahamputra

*403. SHRI MATANG SING: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) what is the latest position of the Lakhimpur-Dibrugarh bridge being constructed over Brahamputra river;

(b) by when it is likely to be completed; and

(c) what are the reasons for delay, if any, in its completion?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): (a) No bridge over river Brahmaputra connecting North Lakhimpur to Dibrugarh in Assam is under construction at present.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

श्री मतंग सिंह : उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा पहला सप्लीमेंट्री है—क्या मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि असम सरकार ने इस पुल को बनाने के लिए भारत सरकार से कोई अनुरोध किया था ? यदि हां, तो क्या कारण है कि इस पुल को बनाने के लिए भारत सरकार ने अभी तक को निर्णय नहीं लिया है ?

श्री जगदीश टाइटलर : ऐसी बात नहीं है । इस पुल के बारे में यह बताना चाहूंगा कि 29 मई को कैबिनेट कमेटी आन पोलिटिकल अफेयर्ज ने इस प्राजेक्ट को समझा और डिसकस किया और यह सोचा कि यह बहुत महंगा पड़ेगा । इसलिए ओवर आल नेशनल पर्सपेक्टिव में सोचा कि इस ब्रिज को बनाना चाहिए । . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री मतंग सिंह : बनाना चाहिए कि नहीं बनाना चाहिए ।

श्री जगदीश टाईटलर : बनाना चाहिये । 23 सितम्बर 1991 को कमेटी आफ सेक्रेटरीज ने इस बात को सोचा और उन्होंने कहा कि जब जोगी पाड़ा ब्रिज बन रहा है, जब वह कम्पलीट हो जाएगा, उसके बाद इसके बारे में सोचा जायेगा ।

22 अक्तूबर, को प्रधान मंत्री ने एक मीटिंग ली, जिसमें यह बताया गया कि असम डेलिगेशन उनसे मिला था कि जो न्यू रेलवे-कम-रोड ब्रिज बन रहा है भोगीबिल में—यह सोचा जा सकता है जब जोगीपाड़ा का पुल कंप्लीट होगा ।